APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/527,137	03/16/2000	Michael E. Pietraszak	14531.57.2	1992

			EXAMINER
47973	7590	11/16/2004	KOENIG, ANDREW Y

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/527,137	PIETRASZAK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew Y Koenig	2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 August 2004</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20,23-51,54-56,58-69,72,74-79 and 81-85* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) *84 and 85* is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,10,13-20,23-50,54-56,58-69,72,74-79 and 81-83* is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) *8,11,12 and 51* is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-20, 23-50, 54-56, 58-

69, 72, 74-83 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 84 and 85 are allowed.

3.   Claims 8, 11, 12, and 51 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5.   Claims 20, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as

failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in

the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use

the invention.

Claim 20 recites, "the writer module removes a specific sharing day from the database," which appears to meet the written description requirements (see pg. 22, ll. 16-17), however one skilled in the art would not know how to make this function in that its functionality is unknown; specifically on how the day being shared.

Claim 33 recites a similar feature of sharing, as discussed in claim 20 (see above). Claim 33 recites, "wherein the function adds a unique sharing day to the database." One skilled in the art would not know how to make this function in that its functionality is unknown; specifically on how the day being shared.

Claim 34 recites a similar feature of sharing, as discussed in claim 20 (see above). Claim 34 recites, "wherein the function links a unique sharing day to the database." One skilled in the art would not know how to make this function in that its functionality is unknown; specifically on how the day being shared.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, 15-17, 19, 23-32, and 35-42, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,157,411 to Williams et al. (Williams) in view of U.S. Patent 5,550,576 to Klosterman and U.S. Patent 5,557,724 to Sampat et al. (Sampat).

Regarding claims 1 and 42, Williams teaches gathering data from plural inputs

(such as from a DSS receiver, vertical blanking interval (VBI), and other remote sources

(col. 5, ll. 22-51) and storing the data in database. Further, Williams teaches a data

parser 204, which collects the data from the various sources and the data engine 206

for storing the data in the database (col. 5-6, ll. 62-9). Williams teaches different

loaders each receives data from a different source, wherein the data is collected at a

writer module. Williams teaches plural inputs (such as from a DSS receiver, vertical

blanking interval (VBI), and other remote sources (col. 5, ll. 22-51) and storing the data

in database. Further, Williams teaches a data parser 204, which collects the data from

the various sources and the data engine 206 for storing the data in the database (col. 5-

6, ll. 62-9). Whereas Williams discloses a data parser (204), Williams does not explicitly

disclose a plurality of EPG loaders, per se, wherein each EPG loader receives data

from a different EPG source. The data parser of Williams clearly has a plurality of

loaders within the data parser (204) in order to receive the data signals from the various

sources in that each the sources have mutually exclusive interfaces (e.g. receiving data

from the vertical blanking interval (VBI) requires different methods from DSS and

modem transfers). Accordingly, Williams teaches a plurality of loaders (within the data

parser 204), wherein each receives data from a different sources. Further, Williams

teaches a data engine 206 for storing the data in the database (col. 5-6, ll. 62-9).

Williams is silent on explicitly using the data for an electronic program guide (EPG).

Klosterman teaches merging channel guide information from different sources for

presentation (col. 2, ll. 23-31, col. 2-3, ll. 64-9) and arranged in a guide (which reads on

an EPG)(col. 6, ll. 34-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by gathering data from plural sources and displaying in an EPG as taught by Klosterman in order to provide a convenient user interface to the user thereby providing access to various channels independent of source. Williams is silent on resolving conflicts from at least two different sources. Klosterman teaches noting or deleting duplicative names of names from a cable and DBS source (col. 6, ll. 39-50), which equates to resolving conflicts from at least two different sources according to a conflict resolution criteria. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by resolving conflicts from at least two different sources according to a conflict resolution criteria as taught by Klosterman in order to reduce duplication thereby enabling the guide to show more relevant information to the user. Williams is silent on calling and executing functions. Sampat teaches loading functions from modules and enabling execution of the functions (col. 33, ll. 6-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by loading and executing functions as taught by Sampat in order to provide a uniform interface for a program to access resources thereby promoting a more robust and platform independent system.

Further regarding claims 1 and 4, Williams teaches adding a newly generated field to the database (col. 6-7, ll. 53-4), which equates to creating a new categorization system for storing the EPG data.

Further regarding claims 1 and 5, Williams teaches adding a newly generated field to the database (col. 6-7, II. 53-4), which equates to adding a category to the database.

Regarding claim 6, Williams teaches associated data with their sources, which equates to mapping a category pair to a specific program col. 5, II. 22-51, col. 8 , II. 44-49).

Regarding claims 7, 24, 32, the combination of Williams, Klosterman, and Sampat has been discussed in claim 1. Further, the combination teaches a placing content into an EPG, clearly at least for updating and the initial startup of the device, new EPG channel information is inherently added to the database in order to access and process the information from the database itself.

Regarding claims 9,10, 15, 31, Williams is silent on removing channel and program data. Official Notice is taken that removing channel and program data is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by removing channel and program data in order to eliminate out-of-date and undesirable channel information from the database.

Regarding claims 16, 17, 19, Williams is silent on removing a property from a program object and a schedule entry. Official Notice is taken that replacing data in an EPG is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by replacing data, which equates to removing (and adding) data to program objects of a schedule entry in

order to maintain a current and accurate guide, thereby presenting useful information to the user.

Regarding claim 23, the combination of Williams, Klosterman, and Sampat has been discussed in claim 1. Williams is silent on removing duplicates (col. 6, ll. 39-50), which equates to setting a preferred result for a condition. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by removing duplicates as taught by Klosterman in order to provide an efficient comprehensive guide to the user.

Regarding claims 25-28, Williams is silent on adding extensible name-value properties to different fields. Official Notice is taken that use of an extensible name-value is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by using extensible name-values in order to further describe a field, code, and provide additional information to the user.

Regarding claim 29, Williams is silent on a purchase string to a schedule entry. Official Notice is taken that purchasing programs is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by purchasing programs such as pay-per-views (PPV) and video-on-demand (VOD) programs in order to provide additional services to the user and provide a means to select the programs.

Regarding claim 30, Williams teaches traits including ratings (col. 7, ll. 21-29).

Regarding claims 35-36, Williams is silent on indicating completion of the database or EPG services storage. Official Notice is taken that providing software indications (such as status information) is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to modify Williams by providing indications in order to ensure that the data being accessed is valid.

Regarding claims 37, Williams teaches activating the appropriate devices when requested by the user, clearly there exists a relationship between the entry in the database and the source (col. 8, ll. 1-59).

Regarding claims 38 and 41, Williams teaches network addresses such as uniform resource locators (col. 7, ll. 21-29).

Regarding claim 39 and 40, Williams is silent on mapping a weblink to a channel or a program. Official Notice is taken that mapping a weblink to a channel or program is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by mapping a weblink to a channel and a program in order to provide the user with additional information thereby increasing interactivity.

8.   Claims 1, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,157,411 to Williams et al. (Williams) in view of U.S. Patent 5,550,576 to Klosterman, U.S. Patent 5,557,724 to Sampat et al. (Sampat), and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0000194 to Sequeira.

Further regarding claims 1 and 13, the combination of Williams, Sampat, and

Klosterman are silent on removing a specific categorization from the database.

Sequeira teaches removing a specific field from a database (pg. 5, para. 0053, table 1),

which equates to a specific categorization.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the EPG database by removing specific fields

from records as taught by Sequeira in order to provide routines to manage and maintain

the data in the data thereby increasing data integrity.

Further regarding claims 1 and 18, the combination of Williams, Sampat, and

Klosterman are silent on removing a property from a weblink object. Sequeira teaches

removing properties of objects (pg. 5, para. 0053, table 1).   Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the EPG database by removing

properties of objects as taught by Sequeira in order to remote a weblink object thereby

providing routines to manage and maintain the data in the data thereby increasing data

integrity.

9.   Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent 5,550,576 to Klosterman, U.S. Patent 5,557,724 to Sampat et al. (Sampat),

and U.S. Patent 6,216,134 to Heckerman et al. (Heckerman).

Further regarding claims 1 and 14, the combination of Williams, Sampat, and

Klosterman are silent on removing a specific category pair from the database.

Heckerman teaches removing all category pair from a database (fig. 11, col. 15-16, ll.

60-10).   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

modify the EPG database by removing specific category pair as taught by Heckerman in order to efficiently remove data from the database.

10.   Claims 43-50, 54-56, 58-69, 72, 74-79, and 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,550,576 to Klosterman, U.S. Patent 5,557,724 to Sampat et al. (Sampat), and U.S. Patent 5,818,935 to Maa.

        Regarding claims 43 and 78, Williams teaches gathering data from plural inputs (such as from a DSS receiver, vertical blanking interval (VBI), and other remote sources (col. 5, ll. 22-51) and storing the data in database. Further, Williams teaches a data parser 204, which collects the data from the various sources and the data engine 206 for storing the data in the database (col. 5-6, ll. 62-9). Williams teaches different loaders each receives data from a different source, wherein the data is collected at a writer module. Williams teaches plural inputs (such as from a DSS receiver, vertical blanking interval (VBI), and other remote sources (col. 5, ll. 22-51) and storing the data in database. Further, Williams teaches a data parser 204, which collects the data from the various sources and the data engine 206 for storing the data in the database (col. 5-6, ll. 62-9). Whereas Williams discloses a data parser (204), Williams does not explicitly disclose a plurality of EPG loaders, per se, wherein each EPG loader receives data from a different EPG source. The data parser of Williams clearly has a plurality of loaders within the data parser (204) in order to receive the data signals from the various sources in that each the sources have mutually exclusive interfaces (e.g. receiving data from the vertical blanking interval (VBI) requires different methods from DSS and

modem transfers). Accordingly, Williams teaches a plurality of loaders (within the data

parser 204), wherein each receives data from a different sources. Further, Williams

teaches a data engine 206 for storing the data in the database (col. 5-6, ll. 62-9).

Williams is silent on explicitly using the data for an electronic program guide (EPG).

Klosterman teaches merging channel guide information from different sources for

presentation (col. 2, ll. 23-31, col. 2-3, ll. 64-9) and arranged in a guide (which reads on

an EPG)(col. 6, ll. 34-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by gathering data from

plural sources and displaying in an EPG as taught by Klosterman in order to provide a

convenient user interface to the user thereby providing access to various channels

independent of source. Williams is silent on resolving conflicts from at least two

different sources. Klosterman teaches noting or deleting duplicative names of names

from a cable and DBS source (col. 6, ll. 39-50), which equates to resolving conflicts

from at least two different sources according to a conflict resolution criteria. Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify Williams by resolving conflicts from at least two different sources

according to a conflict resolution criteria as taught by Klosterman in order to reduce

duplication thereby enabling the guide to show more relevant information to the user.

Williams is silent on calling and executing functions. Sampat teaches loading functions

from modules and enabling execution of the functions (col. 33, ll. 6-23). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to

modify Williams by loading and executing functions as taught by Sampat in order to

provide a uniform interface for a program to access resources thereby promoting a

more robust and platform independent system. Williams is silent on calling and

executing functions. Sampat teaches client applications calling functions through the

media service manager (MSM) application programming interface (API) for retrieving

and gathering data for the client application (col. 15, ll. 4-16). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify

Williams by calling and executing functions from the API to retrieve and access data as

taught by Sampat in order to provide a uniform interface for a program to access

resources thereby promoting a more robust and platform independent system.

Further regarding claims 43, 75, and 78 the combination of Williams, Klosterman,

and Sampat teaches a and EPG database and calling and executing functions, but is

silent on a function indicating that a new category has been added to the database.

Maa teaches an isupdate function that indicates data having been changed (col. 8, ll.

29-41), further adding new categories is taught by Williams (col. 67, ll. 53-4). Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify Williams, Klosterman, and Sampat by using an isupdate function

that indicates data having been changed as taught by Maa in order to indicate a new

category thereby efficiently manage and service data thereby ensuring that the data is

the most recent

Further regarding claims 43, 76, and 78, the combination of Williams,

Klosterman, and Sampat teaches a and EPG database and calling and executing

functions, but is silent on a function indicating that a new channel has been added to the

database. Maa teaches an isupdate function that indicates data having been changed (col. 8, ll. 29-41), further in the EPG environment new channel information is clearly received (such as shown in Klosterman). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams, Klosterman, and Sampat by using an isupdate function that indicates data having been changed as taught by Maa in order to indicate a new channel has been added thereby efficiently manage data and ensuring that the data is the most recent.

Further regarding claims 43, 77, and 78, the combination of Williams, Klosterman, and Sampat teaches a and EPG database and calling and executing functions, but is silent on a function indicating data having been changed to the database. Maa teaches an isupdate function that indicates data having been changed (col. 8, ll. 29-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams, Klosterman, and Sampat by using an isupdate function that indicates data having been changed as taught by Maa in order to efficiently manage and service data thereby ensuring that the data is the most recent.

Regarding claim 44, Williams teaches various methods for displaying information, such as alphabetically, by rating, genre, etc, which reads on a collection of names of known schemes for organizing.

Regarding claim 45, Williams teaches returning an end time to a program (col. 7, ll. 21-29).

Regarding claim 46, Williams is silent on returning the furthest time in the future when a program starts. Official Notice is taken that returning the furthest time in the future when a program starts is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by returning the furthest time in the future when a program starts in order to enable the user to select a desirable time to view the programming.

Regarding claims 47-48, Williams teaches returning information on programs (col. 7, ll. 21-29), which confirms the channel and indicates that the channel data exists.

Regarding claim 49, Williams teaches organizing on ratings (col. 7, ll. 21-29, col. 8, ll. 15-24), which clearly has a collection of strings for names of the rating.

Regarding claim 50, Williams teaches altering the presentation order of programs, which is a function that retrieves a channel collections (col. 8, ll. 15-27).

Regarding claims 54 and 55, Williams teaches searching using the query interface (col. 6, ll. 15-27, col. 7, ll. 21-29).

Regarding claim 56, Williams teaches associating the source and channel with the item in the database (col. 8, ll. 40-59).

Regarding claim 58, Williams teaches searching (col. 6, ll. 15-27), which reads on a function returns information indicating whether data is found for a range.

Regarding claim 59, Klosterman teaches displaying an EPG, which has been discussed in claim 1, which equates to retrieving a program object representing a program shown on a specified channel at a specified time.

Regarding claims 60-64, 68, 69, Williams teaches an end time, duration, rating, start time, and title (col. 7, ll. 21-29)

Regarding claims 65-66, the system of Williams inherently adds data into the database in order to access the information at a later time, clearly the presence of new information would necessitate the information to be added to the database, which equates to a function indicating an event should be fired when a new channel has been added.

Regarding claim 67, the combination of Williams and Klosterman has been addressed in the discussion of claim 1. Klosterman teaches displaying a guide for a given time period (fig. 2), which equates to a function returns updates occurring within a particular time range.

Regarding claim 72, Williams is silent on searching for a case-insensitive string. Official Notice is taken that searching a case-insensitive string is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by using a case-insensitive string in order to provide a more useful user interface thereby making the searches more efficient.

Regarding claim 74, Williams teaches searching for programs, but is silent on retrieving a collection of sub-category names for a given category. Official Notice is taken that retrieving a collection of sub-category names for a given category is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by retrieving a collection of sub-

category names for a given category in order to facilitate searching thereby simplifying the searches for the user.

Regarding claim 79, the combination of Williams and Klosterman has been addressed in the discussion of claim 1. Klosterman teaches deleting one of the channels or both of the channels from two different sources, thereby giving precedence to EPG data received from the sources (col. 6, ll. 34-56).

Regarding claim 81, the combination of Williams and Klosterman has been addressed in the discussion of claim 1. Klosterman teaches deleting one of the channels or both of the channels from two different sources, thereby allowing the user to select a conflict resolution scheme (col. 6, ll. 34-56).

Regarding claim 82, the combination of Williams and Klosterman has been addressed in the discussion of claim 1. Klosterman teaches deleting one of the channels or both of the channels from two different sources, thereby enabling the user to assign a priority to the EPG loader (col. 6, ll. 34-56).

Regarding claim 83, the combination of Williams and Klosterman has been addressed in the discussion of claim 1. Klosterman teaches the user deleting one of the channels or both of the channels from two different sources (col. 6, ll. 34-56), which is performed in software which reads on an application.

11.   Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,157,411 to Williams et al. (Williams), U.S. Patent 5,550,576 to Klosterman, and

U.S. Patent 5,557,724 to Sampat et al. (Sampat) in view of U.S. Patent 5,850,218 to LaJoie et al. (LaJoie).

Regarding claim 2, Williams teaches traits including title, channel, station call letters, actors/actresses/artists, duration, start time, end time, genre, critique, rating, location of software files, parameters for executing applications, network addresses such as uniform resource locators, etc (col. 7, ll. 21-29), but is silent on a new audio subchannel format. LaJoie teaches SAP (fig. 8, label 180, col. 19, ll. 29-38), which is an alternative audio subchannel format displayed on an EPG. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by adding an audio subchannel format thereby displaying the alternative audio subchannel as an option to the user as taught by LaJoie in order to further enable the user to select a desired channel for listening.

Regarding claim 3, Williams is silent on adding a new audio subchannel format to a schedule entry. LaJoie teaches SAP (fig. 8, label 180, col. 19, ll. 29-38) associated to a program thereby related to a schedule entry, which was clearly added in order to display its status. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by adding a new audio subchannel to a schedule entry as taught by LaJoie in order to display and present the information to the user, thereby enabling the user to select the desired audio subchannel.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Y Koenig whose telephone number is (703) 306-0399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:30 - 6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (703) 305-4755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ayk

CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER